

4
4
OBSERVATIONS

ON A

PAMPHLET,

SUPPOSED TO BE WRITTEN BY AN ENGLISHMAN,

ENTITLED,

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST AN

UNION.

BY A STUDENT OF TRINITY COLLEGE.

*When a stranger offers his services, we have reason to
look to ourselves.*

ÆSOP'S FABLES.

DUBLIN:

PRINTED BY J. MILLIKEN, NO. 32, GRAFTON-STREET.

1799.



A N

A N S W E R, &c.

THE subject of an Union with Great Britain had been for some time considered vague and without any foundation. But now we have every reason for supposing that the sole object of the British Cabinet is to have the British and Irish legislature incorporated; this is a subject of the greatest importance and magnitude to the people of this kingdom, if we regard that independence for which we struggled so long. But is this a time to discuss this momentous subject? some people will say not, and that we ought to suspend every
opinion

opinion on it till we can ascertain upon what terms an Union will be made; away with such idle talk, who can be so blind as not to see the terms when he reads the pamphlet *for and against an Union*; who can be so stupid as not to know that an *Union* is in agitation, when a man high in office takes upon him to enumerate the many advantages that must result to this kingdom from an Union? the fow in the fable should warn us *that when a stranger offers his services we have reason to look to ourselves*. I say that now is the time to discuss this subject, while we can use that freedom of speech which an Union may check, and while the press, that national organ, remain to convey our sentiments.

The first and indeed the most serious alarm, was sounded by a confidential friend to the English Government, and I am sorry to find, that any gentleman should endeavour to impose arguments upon the Irish nation, the most erroneous that could be possibly dictated; you are, I am informed, an Englishman, this may palliate your guilt; as a motive of patriotism may induce you to aggrandize your own country; but it should not be at the expence of impoverishing ours, I don't charge you with corruption,
but

but I clearly see that your intention is to corrupt and bias the minds of Irishmen by false reasoning.

You begin by taking an abstract view of *two independent states whose separate existence is mutually inconvenient till they form themselves into an Union, this was, you say, the case with the Romans and the Sabine States*, these States were joined by nature, they were not separated by any sea or freight, and from some circumstances, became afterwards united; if the Romans and Sabines, thought it their mutual advantage to unite and cease from the wars in which they were engaged at that period, how far does that prove that Ireland which is separated by nature should unite with England? these two kingdoms are connected by a *constitutional confederation*, they are not at war with one another as the Sabines and Romans were, the rude and uncivilized government of infant Rome is not like ours; what similitude is there in the trade, commerce, customs, constitution, religion and laws of Rome and ours? not the smallest. Did you think that the Irish were ignorant of the history of that country, and that your words would be

be considered as infallible? if you did, you are mistaken, your reference to ancient politics in their primitive state and not yet modelled by the hand of experience, cannot convince us that such a system if adopted by this country would be the *summum bonum* of our happiness; if those two states mutually agreed to unite and that the subjects of Tatius and Romulus unanimously concurred to become *one and indivisible*, it does not appear as yet, that the people of Ireland are willing to unite with England, and therefore a comparison made between two kingdoms diametrically opposite in nature and policy, cannot in sound sense and reason be considered sufficiently cogent or in any possible manner, an argument why Ireland should unite with England, or that an Union would contribute to our happiness and grandeur.

Your argument concerning the Saxon Heph-tarchy is in every degree as absurd; true it is that the seven kingdoms became united into one empire, but can England and Ireland become one empire? not till the Atlantic by the force of its waters, shakes Ireland from its foundation, and like an unwieldy flotilla lashes it to the
English

English shore. Historians tell us that Sicily was once joined to Italy, I should not be surprised if this subtle reasoner told us that Ireland was once really *united* to England, till it was torn from it by the force of the waters. You ask us did the people of *the Saxon heptarchy lose their independence?* oh absurdity! what analogy has the independence of the heptarchy of England, to the independence of Ireland? this country was once a tesserachy, and did it lose its independence when Henry the II. annexed it to England? it was forced to do so, as to the heptarchy they were forced to unite; with whom? with Englishmen? that is Englishmen united with Englishmen, wonderful indeed. Wales and Scotland* were originally joined by nature, they underwent many changes from time to time under different princes, notwithstanding all their changes they are now united, such are the effects of nature, *naturam expellas furca tamen usque recurret*; he asks us, how is a Welchman degraded by being represented in the British Parliament? I ask in turn how is a Munster-man degraded by being represented in the Irish Par-

* See Mr. Spencer's pamphlet on the state of Scotland.
liament?

liament? but it is highly degrading to him to be represented in a country which he may never cast his eyes upon.

The comparison you make with respect to an Union is to a partnership in trade, you say if a merchant for want of credit and capital, cannot carry on trade it will be of advantage to such a person to unite himself with an extensive and wealthy firm, now are we to consider Ireland as a bankrupt without credit or capital, and England the extensive and wealthy firm? this must be the meaning of your argument, then see how the matter stands; the national debt of England is 500 millions of money, the debt of Ireland 10 millions, does England exceed Ireland in wealth and population, in the same proportion that she exceeds her in the national debt? grant that England does, and why do I grant it, do you ask, to shew if this be the case, England would not be so willing to incorporate with us, I say unless she was sure of gaining considerably by it. As for my part, I should think it imprudent in an extensive and wealthy merchant to take a bankrupt into partnership, if the English minister

ter sees us overwhelmed in debt and reduced to the lowest ebb of distress, would it be politic in him to take us into partnership? If compassion did not operate on him, prudence never could; if on the other hand, he sees us wealthy and every prospect before us of becoming more prosperous, would not policy dictate to him a plan of uniting with us? Yes, surely. Now as both kingdoms stand in point of wealth, commerce, art, sciences, and if England excels us in every single matter of those in a tenfold proportion, if she is liable to support herself and swim across the pool in which Ireland would be swallowed up, would it not be the height of folly to say, Ireland we see you sinking, and we are willing to plunge ourselves into inevitable destruction to try to save you? Believe me that England, or rather the English minister, is no fool, he sees his interest in subjecting us to his own country and reducing us to a petty province. But if there is an Union, surely Ireland is not responsible for the 500 millions of money; grant it; the British Parliament will promise not to charge to

B

our

our account a debt which we never contracted. Must Ireland be responsible for any debts that shall be contracted after the Union? why not? We are told that our trade and commerce will not be limited; so that if England carries on the war for a few years more, the consolidated debt of England and Ireland must be many millions more; but we are told by this pamphleteer, that it does not avail, an Union will make up for any debt or impost, an Union will compensate us for our independence. *O tempora! o mores!* who will believe it? no Irishman. Have you not represented the Irish as immoral, uncivilized and irreligious, divided by civil and religious discontents, torn asunder by rebellion and convulsed by insurrections? have you not on the other hand buzzed into the ears of Europe, the civilized state of the English, the simplicity of their morals, and their strict adherence to the laws of their country? If this be the case, which must be so, when it comes from the mouth of an *Englishman*, and as it seems divested of all *prejudice* and *partiality*, how is it natural to imagine that the moral *Englishman*, will
 associate

associate with the vicious *Irishman*, that the opulent and extensive English merchant will join trade with the poor and perfidious *Irishman*? You might as well assert that the fierce tyger would live in amity with the innocent lamb, or the voracious falcon with the mild dove; but you will say that animals never formed by nature to agree, will become reconciled by time and custom, and that the kingdom at a future period will become the repository of wealth and grandeur, when the *wild Irish* become incorporated with the *docile English*; this at most is but a promise, and how are the Irish to fare till the promise will be accomplished? I suppose as well as we can. I think that the old adage may be applied here with some propriety, *live horse and you will get grass*. I fear that before that period many of us will emigrate to some foreign country; but why do I talk of emigration? happy would it be if we were allowed to emigrate from an impoverished country; we must remain here to support absentees, who will grind us, to support pride, vain glory and ambition; this will be one good effect resulting from an Union;

tradesmen

tradesmen and manufacturers, must for want of work enlist or get into the navy, and very opportunely one hundred and twenty thousand men are wanting at present to man the navy. Sparta at one time thought it prudent to stop her trade in order to man her fleets.

Another very substantial reason you assign for an Union is, that the state of France dictates its policy. You say that France has not only united to her and incorporated a great addition of territory, but has rendered absolutely dependant on her will, almost all the small states that surround her; now I candidly ask you, would it be sound policy in England to adopt plans similar to France? to extend principles which every honest man detests; to use such political measures as would incorporate England and Ireland, and to make them *one* and *indivisible*? this would militate against that principle of justice and honour which has dignified England; it would be repugnant to that virtuous system of policy which has raised the head of England so much above other countries, *quantum*

tum lenta solent inter viburna cupressi. Is this plain reasoning? I hope I don't give you offence while I expose your errors; I am not personal, nor would I wish to be so, though my indignation would often prompt me; virulence of speech is no way to confute an argument.—This country cries out against an Union, except those who, in your own words, are under *British influence*; the voice of the people, as Locke says, must sway in every country, our incessant cry is *British connexion, but no Union.* The loyalists in this country are exceedingly numerous, and willing to support the present laws and constitution, but if this *constitution* is changed, or any innovations made to destroy *legislative independence*, I dread the consequences. I am a loyalist, and should be very sorry to see this country separated from England, and I should be equally sorry to see it united; though well I love England I love my own better, said the *old Irish Patriot*; it would be contrary to the first principle of nature to love another better than himself. The loyalists have saved this country, their
zeal

zeal and activity is unparalleled in the page of history, and now the forcing an Union down the throats of those who stepped forward in the hour of danger, would be well rewarding their toils, their labours, and voluntary contributions.

But to return to your elaborate essay on an Union; you tell us that the sovereign resides in England; and so he does; you say that it is the repository of wealth and grandeur; why not, when you tell us that *one million* of money goes annually from this country to absentees, won't an Union encrease the number of absentees and coax them from this country? you admit it, won't this consequently diminish the wealth of this kingdom? what compensation can England make us for all the tradesmen and manufacturers, all the Irish Peers and representatives that an Union will carry over? is there any probability of any coming here from England? they did not come here while we enjoyed peace and harmony; but you tell us that a free trade and the advantages of a more extensive commerce, will induce

duce them to come and settle in this kingdom ; absurd talk, a learned gentleman has already observed “ that we can trade to any
 “ part of the globe except the East Indies, and
 “ how can an Union give Ireland more of this
 “ trade than it possesses, for it would in case
 “ of an Union as well as now only be allowed
 “ to share in it by individual merchants, becoming proprietors of East India stock.”

You say that Scotland previous to the Union, stood as Ireland does at present, I deny it: Scotland in the first place is joined by nature to England, Ireland is not so, it was foolish prejudice that annexed Scotland, for which she afterwards repented, and this argument of yours in favour of an Union between England and Ireland, shews us why Ireland should not unite with England. When a tax upon malt was opposed by the representatives of Scotland in the British house, what did it avail? how did England treat the Scotch Peers? were not the articles of the Union violated in the face of Europe? is this to us an inducement for an Union? does it not prove to us that England can in despite of the number of
 incorruptible

incorruptible Irish representatives which will sit in the English house, subject Ireland to any tax or contribution it pleases? if you had omitted this argument it would not have displayed so much of the power and preponderancy of English influence. Look to the Union that Margaret Queen of Denmark made, when she united under one head Denmark, Norway and Sweden. What was the consequence? the most bloody wars ensued, which continued for many years. Now Denmark and Sweden are situated exactly as Ireland and England; they are separated by a sea, and when an Union was formed, the result was pernicious to both countries; these are the salutary effects of an Union. In every argument of yours in support of an Union, it is such as if nature designed the countries you have mentioned for an Union. If a person has a great tract of land over which he presides himself, superintends and manages every part of it, extends his care to all who derive any thing under him, will not this place be freer from dissension and wealthier, than if the same person has another tract of ground intercepted by a sea, where a parcel of
idle,

idle, lazy stewards defraud, extort and compel poor tenants to remit their yearly rents? certainly. Now I leave you to apply the parallel; the seven United States you have brought down as an example; what example is this or what argument? does it appear that one million of money went from one state to another to absentees? that all the wealth of those states were collected to one place, like the rays of the sun when brought to a focus? this will not be the case with Ireland, all the hard earned wealth must go to another island; there was no island among these United States; besides their Union was federal and incorporated; you have told us that the *Irish Parliament* is under the influence of the British Cabinet, then if British influence operates so powerfully at this side of the *sea*, how much greater must it be when a few Irish representatives come in contact with a phalanx of British representatives? I have always heard, and I believe it to be the case, that the nearer we approach a disorder the sooner we catch the infection.

Poland you say was destroyed by the *Imperium in imperio*, where every senator was a sovereign ; this vice cannot destroy our constitution, because we have no such vice ; surely our senators are not sovereigns, you might as well assert that our constitution will be destroyed because we are governed by the Beys of Egypt. I dare say your *amanuensis* or *clerk* had assisted you in this ingenious production.

France threatens the destruction of this country, but will an Union with England better protect us than she does at present ? will an *Union* make the Irish more averse to French principles ? will the sound of the word *Union* make us better subjects, or inspire us with enthusiastic loyalty to stem the impetuous torrent of democracy ? as the sound *evoc* inspired the Bacchanalians with wild enthusiasm. Impossible to think that in these enlightened days, when the dark mist of idolatry is dispelled, that any word has such a supernatural quality.

Again,

Again, to support an *Union*, you tell us that the Roman Catholics are three to one in this country, and that they will not drop their claims to political equality; do you mean by this to terrify the Protestants and calumniate the Roman Catholics? true it is, that some of the lower order, nay many of the Roman Catholics, were used as a machine in the hands of the fomenters of the late foul rebellion; but who were those fomenters? were they Roman Catholics? I never heard they were. Was Lord Edward Fitzgerald a Roman Catholic? was Emmet, was Sheares, was Arthur O'Connor? no; therefore I do not consider it fair or just to leave so foul an imputation upon the body of the Roman Catholics. Did not the most respectable Roman Catholics in the kingdom reprobate the conduct of those who joined in the rebellion? did they not exhort the people to return to their allegiance and become amenable to the laws of their country? so that when we know this to be certainly the case, there is no reason for the Protestants to apprehend any danger to their properties or persons. Indeed an infuriate mob of any persuasion,

persuasion, without any subordination commit the foulest crimes ; but even granting that the Roman Catholics are as three to one, how will an *Union* encrease the number of Protestants so as that we will have the proportion of fourteen to three? this is a problem which may puzzle all the mathematicians in Europe. I suppose you intend to prove it by an *argumentum ad absurdum*. Your encouragement to the Roman Catholics of an admission at a future day to additional immunities, and menacing them in the same page, is the clearest proof of the deep laid system of an *Union*. Just as if you said, ye Protestants of Ireland take care, *cavete*; the Roman Catholics will annihilate you; and you Roman Catholics shall get political privileges by joining us in an *Union*. I have no doubt but the English Minister argues thus with himself; if we grant the Roman Catholics every political privilege and of course a seat in Parliament, what influence can they have? suppose the majority of the Irish representatives be Roman Catholics, or if even the whole of them in the political scale (I was going to say scheme) their influence

fluence or preponderance will be just as a fly against an ox; my opinion of the Roman Catholics is, that no offer on the part of the British Minister will induce them to sacrifice the honour and independence of their country for a seat in the British House of Commons, no man is fool enough to act like the dog that let go the *substance* to catch at a *phantum*.

You say that an *Union* will put an end to religious strifes; what strifes between Protestants and Roman Catholics? could any people live in greater amity and harmony, than those people till perverted politics fomented some jealousies which are dwindling away every day? and I venture to say, that every species of animosity will subside before the expiration of one year; the eyes of the Catholics are now open; the political horizon has gone down, and now the illuminating rays of reason are dispelling the gloomy clouds of prejudice.

I ask how will an Union modify the civil and ecclesiastical establishments, when the
Irish

Irish Legislature becomes incorporated with the British? What, cannot civil and ecclesiastical modifications be made now? No, we are told not, because until we give up our rights and independence, the British Legislature cannot make any such changes in our Church or State. By our acceding to such terms, by our giving up our rights, we should display as much ignorance on our part, and act as absurdly as a man who would give up the lease of his ground, under a promise of getting a longer lease in a few years: There is an old proverb, and a true one,—A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush.

How will an Union put a stop to contested elections? I shall tell you how it will affect elections: the honour of obtaining a seat in the British House of Commons will so tickle the vanity of modern Patriots, that no expence will be a bar, no attempt will be left unessayed, in order to attain so honourable a post; there will be no occasion for sending to the palatinate of Germany for freeholders, our absentees or in other words, the men of overgrown property, will, as considering themselves

themselves so many shining planets revolving round the British Minister, assert and claim a superiority over Irishmen, whom they will consider as so many satellites, they will portion out into small lots, those lands which for many years before yielded some support to the industrious cottager; and this same cottager, who a little before had it in his power to contribute to the support of the orphan or desolate widow, must submit now to a scanty pittance, or beg from door to door. When the honour of a golden Seat in another kingdom, and as the common people say, beyond the seas, is offered to view "what abuses will not ensue,"—all the effects of pure patriotism this gentleman will tell us: as for my part I would know how to act, if I was at any immoderate expence to obtain so dignified a *Seat*; I would be silent on several occasions, especially when the interest of my country would be brought in question, and if a *place* or *pension* was offered to poor Irish *Pat*, surely he would * refuse it.

Pray what presentiment had you that the Irish Bar would oppose an Union? Because, you say, it would put a stop to that Parliamen-

tary

* An Irony.

tary market for their abilities. Look back and see, when was the Irish Parliament without Lawyers ; look to the Parliament of England, is it without Lawyers ; who can give counsel for the security of a state ; but thou who art most conversant in the laws and that state ? You give us to understand, that a man cannot be a Politician and a Lawyer at the same time. Does the Minister of England know Law ? Yes, but he is no Lawyer ; but you will tell me, he knows the laws of his country. If I believed in the transmigration of souls, I would not hesitate to say, that the old Stoic Crisippus, has *united* with you, in soul and body. Is it not evident and clear to every one, that your object for attacking the Irish Bar, is to prejudice the minds of the people against it ? I ask you as a man of honour, if you have any, who have a better right to know or understand the interests of this country, than the Irish Bar ? they are in duty bound to their country—to support it. Who, I ask again, but the Irish Bar, can see the advantages or disadvantages of an *Union* ? and they have clearly seen the disadvantage that would result from an Union.

try. Is it to be supposed that an Englishman will be more interested for the independence of Ireland, than an Irishman? Do not you, when you talk of a Parliamentary market, cast a stigma upon the Irish House of Commons? Don't you openly charge the honorable Members of that House, with *corruption*? 'tis an insult upon the nation; 'tis an insult upon the *Parliament of Ireland*; 'tis an insult upon the *Irish Bar*. *A Parliamentary Market!* Yes, a Parliamentary Market. I suppose that by way of apology, you think that there are some men of the Bar, who will support an Union, and that those are gentlemen who have *thought most on the subject*; your words are verified,—* the *puny minority* of the Bar are such as have not extended their circle to *politics*; it is a doubt to me if some of them have worn the fable gown and hoary wig three terms, or ever handled a brief, and those are the gentlemen

D you

* Perhaps the Supporter of the Union does not know that one of the puny minority has employed his time, of late, in composing a song called *The Grinder!* and that this same gentleman makes himself more busy at assemblies, and flirting with this lady and that lady, than studying the Law! He will be well rewarded, not for his talents. O Flirting Tom!

you tell us, who have thought best on the subject of an *Union*!—I did not hear the name of a *Saurin* mentioned amongst our *young Patriots*; but has he not thought best on the subject?—Would to God that every Irishman possessed such honor and patriotism.

The probability of a modus in tythes, the probability of the Irish Peers being represented like the Scotch Peers, the probability that Dublin will monopolize the corn-trade, the probability of Cork becoming a marine station, here are so many probabilities, heaped one upon another, without any degree of certainty. Mr. Locke, in his Essay on the Human Understanding, has clearly laid down the grounds of probability, and he says that we should particularly attend to the testimony of others, as one of the principal grounds; now if we consider your integrity and design, if you have delivered your sentiments on an Union with a view of supporting the grandeur of your own country, as is evidently the case, this cannot be called integrity towards us; your design then is, I should suppose, to have the security and happiness of both kingdoms established,

established, your design is bad, because as I
 have observed before, the people *una voce*, are
 against an Union, and when the people are una-
 nimous in opposing any measure, surely peace
 and security cannot follow if it be forced on
 them; do you mean to *add fuel to fire*? if
 you do, I see no better way than this poli-
 tical plan which you have adopted. Would
 a second rebellion, or perhaps a third, which
 I fear will be the result of an Union, secure
 the titles and properties of our temporal and
 spiritual Lords? an Union was the cause of
 two successive rebellions in Scotland. Let
 those who wish to secure their persons and
 properties, take but a retrospective view of
 the fatal consequences of that formidable
 Union; let not our Temporal and Spiritual
 Lords be buoyed up with the aerial and fan-
 tastic effusions of an *English Patriot*, nor let
 short-sighted policy dictate ruin and deso-
 lation; let not self-interest overlook public
 advantage, while it clandestinely seeks for
 interlunary happiness in the wild mazes of
 error and meagre policy, God forbid that
 men, who are willing to spill their blood in
 the wide Atlantic, or in the remote East and
 West Indies, in defence of the King and
 Constitution,

Constitution, should have recourse to a more disagreeable alternative. It would be a dear purchase to England, to cement an Union by a copious effusion of blood; and may destruction attend the promoters of so horrid a deed. If England disputes her superiority with Ireland by land, what may be the consequence? Keen-eyed France may look on, till both England and Ireland become exhausted, and then indeed she may easily make England and Ireland *one and indivisible*. Cassandra often foretold the fate of Troy, but her predictions were disregarded, till time accomplished them,

I have read of men in ancient and modern history, who had given up the independence, the honor and dignity of their country, to gratify pride and odious ambition, but I hope Ireland has not produced such monsters; other countries have, and history records them as branded with every species of infamy and disgrace. *O Fides!* *O Honor!*

Great and delusive are your promises to the * inhabitants of Cork; it is no less than
telling

* Tom Paine's pamphlets were never circulated with more industry, than the pamphlet "*For and Against an Union*," many of them are given gratis. *O what a bait for Gulls!*

telling them, that *probably* a dock-yard may be built there: I never before heard that England had any such thing in contemplation, or that it was possible to make a dock-yard in Cork,—their trade of course must encrease. Is there any one merchant in Cork, if there was an Union to-morrow, and to see this country deserted, or even not deserted, would say, I must become more extensive in trade and commerce? Believe me, that nothing but the compleatest folly, and the greatest degree of error, could make them believe, or give the smallest credit to any thing *our English Patriot* should say. The inhabitants of *Cork*, as well as those of all Ireland, were a long time excluded from a free trade; they were a long time governed by laws made in another country; they know how long Ireland, in the political scale of Europe, was looked upon with an eye of contempt: but now it is not the case, the inhabitants of Cork enjoy the blessings of a free trade; they are represented in their own country. But an Union will transpose and change the order of things. You are considered a prosperous people by all the world; and while you are prosperous remain so as long as you possibly can.

You

You forgot to tell Limerick how England behaved, while she had a power of legislating for us. Did not England violate her treaty with Limerick? oh yes, you may say, but that happened a long time ago! *Ob punica fides.* How did England behave to us in respect to the Linen trade, which is our staple trade, and why is it? because she failed in all her exertions to bring it to perfection in Scotland and at her own home.

But you did not forget to tell, and that in the most barefaced manner, that if there was an *Union** and the country tranquilized, *taxes* would be lower, why was not this the case in England after the American war and when there was peace? did not the taxes daily encrease? After the American war the national debt of England was but insignificant if compared to the present; but now you have boldness to assert in the face of Ireland, that if there is an Union and the country tranquilized, taxes will be lighter. The national debt is at present very great and will be greater, which if there

* A proprietor of a borough declared some time ago that an Union would completely destroy this kingdom; but afterwards upon hearing that 15,000*l.* would be given as a compensation for every borough; said, oh what did he not say!!!

there shall be an Union Ireland must share in; I say then that it is impossible to have the taxes lower while the national debt is so enormous.

Your attack upon the volunteers of Ireland is the basest and the most malevolent I ever read, it is degrading the human nature to find so much rancour and such ungenerous principles in the breast of any human being. Who procured for us a free trade, and that power of legislating for ourselves, but the volunteers of Ireland? a very pretty contrast you draw between them and the United Irishmen. *Irishmen* learn the advantages and disadvantages of an UNION.

Advantages. *A promise of an equalization of trade, which if England has a mind to break what is to prevent her.*

Disadvantages. *A equalization of taxes and no redress.*

Advantages. *A promise of having the kingdom tranquilized.*

Disadvantages. *A certainty of a second rebellion if we argue from political analogy, as Scotland, United States, Corsica, &c.*

Advantages.

Advantages. *A modus in tythes.*

Disadvantages. *It will make the land tax heavier, this modus could not be settled without an Union, no impossible! an Union will settle every Commotion. Oh infatuation!*

Advantages. *No more.*

Disadvantages. 1st. *A daily encrease of absentees who will carry annually in addition to the old absentees one million more; this will be then two millions of money going every year to England. Oh miserable!*

2d. *No longer a power of legislating for ourselves.*

3d. *That independence for which we struggled so long wrested from us.*

4th. *Ireland a beggarly deserted province.*

5th. *Grass growing in the metropolis of Ireland.*

6th. *Tradesmen starving for want of work.*

7th. *Our university deserted, &c.*

8th. *Sharing in every debt that England incurs.*

9th. *England having it in her power to violate any promise. Oh unfortunate Ireland!*

FINIS.

ERRATA. Page 4 Line 13, read *remains*.—P. 4 L. 21, read *be* after *possibly*.—P. 20 L. 24, a comma after *them*.—P. 21 L. 10, a mark of interrogation after *strifes*.—P. 24 L. 5, read *those* for *thou*.—P. 20. L. 6, *for and that* read *of that*.

